



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,987	09/07/2000	Marcel Rene Bohmer	PHN 17, 631	2245

24737 7590 09/10/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/656,987

Applicant(s)

BOHMER ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph L. Williams

Art Unit

2879

14

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 31 July 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-14, 19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitman et al. (US 5,578,892), of record.

Regarding claim 11, Whitman ('892) discloses in figure 1a and in column 2, line 42 through column 3, line 2 an electric lamp (10) comprising a light source (16) operable to emit visible light; and a light-transmitting lamp vessel (12) accommodating the light source (16) whereby the visible light propagates through the light-transmitting lamp vessel (12) which accommodates the source

Art Unit: 2879

(16), and a light-absorbing coating (11), wherein the light-absorbing coating (11) at least partially covering the light-transmitting lamp vessel (12), the light-absorbing coating (11) including an organically modified silane network (see column 4, lines 31-34 read "methyl trimethoxy silane") and a plurality of pigments (see abstract) dispersed through the organically modified silane network, the plurality of pigments particles for absorbing a first portion of the visible light propagating through the light-absorbing coating (11) without generating a light scattering of a second portion of the visible light propagating through the light-absorbing coating (11) (the properties of praseodymium doped zircon mixed with silica).

Regarding claim 12, Whitman ('892) teaches in column 5, lines 56-59 that the average diameter of the plurality of pigment particles is less than 50 nm (read 1/8 inch diameter).

Regarding claim 13, Whitman ('892) teaches the light-absorbing coating is in liquid form prior to being coated on the light-transmitting lamp vessel; and wherein the liquid form of the light-absorbing material includes a hydrolysis mixture including the organically modified silane network and at least one liquid mixture including a dispersion of the plurality of pigments therein. (see, in part, column 4, lines 31-65)

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 14, Whitman ('892) teaches the plurality of pigment particles are dispersed throughout the organically modified silane network prior to the at least partial covering of the light-absorbing coating on the light-transmitting lamp vessel.

Regarding claim 19, Whitman ('892) teaches the organically modified silane network includes a plurality of silica particles.

Regarding claims 21-23, Whitman ('892) teaches the pigment particles are inorganic pigment particles, organic particles, or a mixture of both (praseodymium doped zircon mixed with silica).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman et al. (US 5,578,892), in view of Tsukada et al. (US 6,129,980), of record.

Regarding claim 15, Whitman ('892) teaches all of the disclosed limitations except for the organically modified silane being selected from the group formed

Art Unit: 2879

by the compounds of the following formula: $R^I Si(OR^{II})_3$, wherein R^I comprises an alkyl group or an aryl group, and wherein R^{II} comprises an alkyl group.

Further regarding claim 15, Tsukada ('980) teaches in column 2, lines 9-50 an organically modified silane being selected from the group formed by the compounds of the following formula: $R^I Si(OR^{II})_3$, wherein R^I comprises an alkyl group or an aryl group, and wherein R^{II} comprises an alkyl group for the purpose of improving the visibility of the emitted light.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the organically modified silane of Tsukada in place of the organically modified silane on the lamp of Whitman for the purpose of reducing reflectance and improving the visibility of the emitted light.

Regarding claim 16, Tsukada ('980) discloses in column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 63 that R^I can comprise CH_3 .

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 15 above.

Regarding claim 17, Tsukada ('980) discloses in column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 63 that R^{II} can be comprised of CH_3 or C_2H_5 .

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 15 above.

Regarding claim 18, Tsukada ('980) discloses in column 23, line 8 through column 26, line 4 (example 1), that the thickness of the film is greater than 1 micron.

Art Unit: 2879

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 15 above.

Regarding claim 20, Tsukada ('980) discloses that the silica is made of "fine particles" and defines fine particle to mean grain size of at least 50 nm (see column 22, lines 42-43).

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 15 above.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman et al. (US 5,578,892) in view of Kawai et al. (US 5,359,255).

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Whitman ('892) discloses all of the claimed limitations except for the claims lamp housing (claim 24) and reflector (claim 25).

Further regarding claims 24 and 25, Kawai ('255) teaches in figure 2 a lamp housing (77) and reflector (73) for a discharge lamp for the purpose of directing the light beam forward and thus improve the brightness of the lamp.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the lamp housing and reflector of Kawai with the lamp of Whitman for the purpose of directing the light beam forward and thus improve the brightness of the lamp.

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-1670. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Joseph Williams

**Examiner
Art Unit 2879**